

# Representation of Duty as an Object of Manipulation in *The Bone Clocks* and *The Buried Giant*

Hamideh Vesalifallah<sup>1</sup>

PhD Candidate, Department of English Language and Literature,  
South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

Roya Yaghoubi (Corresponding Author)<sup>2</sup>

Assistant Professor, Department of English Language and Literature,  
South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22034/cls.2023.62863>

Article Type: Original Article

Page Numbers: 179-193

Received: 15 November 2022

Accepted: 10 May 2023

## Abstract

Deontological ethics emphasizes the connection between duty and the morality of human conduct; nevertheless, Mitchell and Ishiguro touch on a different form of duty, which disagrees with the deontological theory and demonstrates that it is in one's interest. Mitchell in *The Bone Clocks* suggests that one's only duty in life is "to survive," regardless of what may happen to others, but Ishiguro contends in *The Buried Giant* that failing to fulfill a duty that creates a hardship for others will result in downfall. Despite the differences, they both agree that performing one's duty is affected by manipulation and deceit. The present article peruses the concept of duty in David Mitchell's *The Bone Clocks* and Kazuo Ishiguro's *The Buried Giant* and Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Practice provides the framework of the study. Bourdieu believes that accomplishing duty seeks a social strategy to maximize one's profit; therefore, it can easily become manipulative. The research eventually concludes that fulfilling duty in these novels is an object of manipulation which is esteemed in self-centeredness. Moreover, it delves into the definition of habitus to elucidate that it is facing a transition that is entangled with manipulation.

## Keywords

Bourdieu; deceit; deontology; habitus; Kant; Self-interest.

## 1. Introduction

The present research studies the characters' attitudes in *The Bone Clocks* (2014) and *The Buried Giant* (2015) to illustrate how different they portray fulfillment of duty. In the aforementioned novels, David Mitchell and Kazuo Ishiguro, touch on a different form of duty, which contrasts with the definition of duty in deontology. In philosophy, deontological theory emphasizes on the relationship between duty and the morality of human actions (Abraham 27). Deontology believes that an action is considered morally good because of some characteristics of the action itself, not because the action is merely exemplary. However, in these novels, Mitchell and Ishiguro seem to go against it by representing some characters who do not consider the morality of human action. These characters mostly act upon their own interests, and always find a way to justify it.

<sup>1</sup> [yeganehvesali8@gmail.com](mailto:yeganehvesali8@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> [royayaghoubi@gmail.com](mailto:royayaghoubi@gmail.com)

According to Bourdieu, this is a kind of “preferential treat [that is] no longer the product of obedience to a norm but a reproduction strategy,” (*The Logic* 16) taking on its meaning in a system of strategies generated by the habitus and oriented towards realization of the same social function. Regarding the concept of duty, Mitchell in *The Bone Clocks* proposes that “to survive” is the only essential duty in life; hence, if one intends to survive, she should ignore her past history and experiences, even her “reflection in the mirror” (295). On the other hand, Ishiguro in *The Buried Giant* suggests that falling short on fulfilling duty will cause trouble for others, and one should pay the price by life if duty fails.

Relying on Bourdieu’s definition of duty, this research brings forward Kant’s ideas of duty amidst the theory of deontology, to describe the change in the concept of duty in these two novels. Christine Korsgaard discusses that Kant manifest “human motives are natural” (9) although it must be motivated in keeping the agreement with others. On the other hand, Bourdieu asserts that one can “lead others to believe that he did it out of respect for the law;” (*Practical Reason* 89) therefore, he can manipulate and be manipulated easily.

Novels such as *The Bone Clocks* and *The Buried Giant* which deal with the characters’ attitudes towards certain goals through time, can be observed as suitable examples in order to produce a vivid reflection of society. The clash between what the narratives portray and the possibilities of their reality, gives way to what is behind every fulfillment of duty and allows researchers to delve into them in order to discover the intention behind them. Needless to say that these two novels are examining the consequences of not performing duty properly; as a result, these two works are noble contexts to be evaluated in this matter. Then indeed, the researchers aim to answer these questions in observation of these novels: how do the characters esteem performing their duty, and to what extent do they consider morality in fulfilling their duty? Also, they ask what does derive the characters to go against their habitus, or in other words, what causes their transition from what they are supposed to do due to their habitus, and what they actually do?

## **2. Literature Review**

On the importance of narratives, Shamim Black explains that “a representational and interpretive strategy,” (14) is necessary to manifest the characters behaviors regarding the flow of time; thus, the reading of a text must be both representative and explanatory. Simon Couper claims that *The Bone Clocks*’ narrative demonstrates that moments of collision between the self and others can represent and describe the ethical opportunities that the characters encounter. He suggests that “Mitchell privileges ethical action over mere empathy in *The Bone Clocks* by contrasting the pragmatic “doing” of Holly Sykes

and the Horologists against the empathic thinking, feeling, and manipulations of Hugo Lamb and others” (29). Although his research focuses on the notion of time in Mitchell’s novel, he obviously could not ignore how ethics and morality work for the characters. Moreover, he explains that ethical attractiveness is imperative to sacrifice positions of self-centered temporal privilege. By highlighting selfishness and self-centeredness in this novel, Couper suggests that Mitchell is “a critique of mere empathy” (35) and refers to Crispin and his “empty show of ethical action rather than perform the real thing” (36) to prove that. In fact, he claims that Crispin goes against his habitus in the field of literature and acts merely upon his instincts.

Karen Shaw also echoes Mitchell’s comment on contemporary cultural and literary presences. She states that Mitchell believes no space is fixed and everything is prone to change over time (3). However, Bourdieu believes, the field is fixed and this is the habitus that changes from one field to another. Whereas Mitchell accentuates the importance of time over space by representing Horologists and Atemporals, Ishiguro shows this by illustrating the importance of memory and how it works as an agent of time. This fact is the reason that evokes emotions such as hatred, fear, or even jealousy, which is the habitus they came from. Laura Colombino reasserts the same idea and claims that this kind of traumatic collective memory “nurtures the falsehood” (22) that can interconnect the human communities across time and place, which can even cause misinterpretation of events. However, the foundation of their behavior does not change, and those misinterpretations would represent a kind of transition from an old habitus to a new one.

Hafiza Amid explains that Ishiguro in this novel interrogates “the themes of professionalism, trauma, and human morality in the personal, individual lives of the characters,” (32) to show their failures in their experiences, as well as their duties. She asserts that when the “buried” things in the human memories come forth, they are susceptible not only to influences from its past, and its past traumatic experiences and emotions, but its present circumstances as well,” (119) and as a result, people might have radical reactions.

Although all these researchers emphasize the ethics and morality regarding the social interaction of the characters and attaining their duties, they left a gap behind which does not explain what derives the characters to achieve their duty. Moreover, concerning the past experiences and memories they carry, the characters are supposed to act differently due to what their habitus dictates them; yet, it seems that the mentioned articles missed this point which is a crucial one in the matter of transition from what they are supposed to do and what they actually do. The next part of this article elucidates on the concept of duty and Bourdieu’s ideas regarding duties and habitus to fill this gap and answers the

questions posed in the introduction. The application of Bourdieu's definition of habitus and interest in different fields, as well as his observation of duty, and the contrast it has with Kant's viewpoint in fulfilling duty, allows researchers highlight the clash between the morality of accepting a duty and creating one.

### **3. Theoretical Framework: On the Concept of Duty**

The researchers in this study employ Pierre Bourdieu's Theory of Practice to put it in dialogue with theory of deontology in addressing the selected novels. Bourdieu in his major studies, *Outline of a Theory of Practice, Habitus and Field; Lectures at the College de France*, and *Practical Reason* display that nourished habitus and the field alter duty and give way to deception. Although Bourdieu wrote about various topics in these books, the main concepts which are discussed in this research are on habitus and how it affects an individual and a group, being interested in the game, and the concept of duty as an object of manipulation.

#### **3.1. Duty and a Person's Habitus**

Focusing on the notion of habitus in *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Bourdieu draws on his fieldwork in Algeria to exemplify his theoretical propositions. With a detailed study of matrimonial strategies and the role of rite and myth, he analyzes the objectification of habitus, whereby social formations tend to reproduce themselves. In this book Bourdieu defines duty as a "means conforming to social order," which is "fundamentally a question of respecting rhythms, keeping pace, not falling out of line," (161) meaning that if one keeps the pace in order, she has done her duty in the world. This pace must be per social order; therefore, it must be as the rules and regulations confirm. Bourdieu believes that reconstructing the principles and unifying practices in the social world is "nothing other than the socially informed body, with its tastes and distastes, its compulsions and repulsions, with all its senses" (*Outline of a Theory* 162). By senses, he means senses other than the traditional five senses; "the sense of necessity and the sense of duty, reality, balance, common sense, sacred, and the sense of responsibility, moral sense and the sense of practicality;" (*Outline of a Theory* 124) hence, one needs to rely on sensibilities as well as reasons in social actions.

Bourdieu believes that the entity of each study is neither the individual nor the group but the relation between these two. That is to say, the obscure, dual relation between the habitus, as a system of durable disposition, appreciation and action, and the field as a system of objective relations and a space of possible actions and struggles aimed at preserving or transforming the field. As a result, to have a just observation of characters, it is necessary to read the alteration in habitus and the field, simultaneously.

In addition, Bourdieu elucidates that one's habitus defines who that person is, meaning that every decision she makes in life, moral or immoral, is touched by her habitus. Bourdieu continues that, it is like "someone born a boy feels more and more a boy, proud of it and duty-bound to be one, and someone born a girl feels more and more a girl. It is the same thing for those born white or black, rich or poor, etc." (*Habitus and Field* 139). He ascribes the concept of duty to one's habitus, which means one's duty is built in her history and schemas of perception; however, he does not explain what exactly motivates the duty.

### 3.2. Duty as an Object of Manipulation

In *Practical Reason*, Bourdieu collects the fundamentals of *Outline of a Theory of Practice* and *The Logic of Practice*, to present the anthropological roots of the economy, and male domination. He observes marriage traditions in an Algerian tribe, and discovers how easily the concept of duty can alter into a concept called a "favored object of manipulation," (43). Using the metaphor of games, he explains that certain agents can change the game and its rules by the logic of pious hypocrisy to transfigure one's duty into a choice. Bourdieu clarifies that, "A man marries a cousin because he couldn't find another, but he leads others to believe that he did so out of respect for the law; which is without doubt, one of the great motors of virtue and reason in history" (*Practical Reason* 89). Hence, he suggests that even the concept of duty can be manipulating and manipulated by appearance.

In order to understand the motivation of each characters the probable transition that habitus might have in each field must be observed, since, as Bourdieu claims, to play in a social game, one should be interested in that specific game, and to find interest, one must discover her disinterestedness in it. Returning to the example of the marriage tradition, in the field of marriage, the agent manipulates his fellows to transfigure his duty of getting married to his cousin as his own choice, nevertheless what he does is the manipulation that reconstructs his interest in the marriage and fulfills his duty. As a result, it seems highly confusing how one's habitus can remain intact through time, in different circumstances of specific fields.

### 3.3. Theory of Deontology, Kant, and the Concept of Duty

Deontology is a notoriously difficult term to define; Gerald Guas characterizes deontology as the notions of the good and the right. He states that, "the notions of right, wrong, duty, and obligation become the core of ethical life," (189) since moralities justify imperatival notions of right and wrong in modern conditions in which one constantly confronts the others whom she does not know; thus, their notions of good and desirable differs. In Robert Olson's words, deontic reasons are imperatival rather than attractive,

and they merely instruct to perform duties as performance is required, not because the action attracts one. Hence, it is relevant that the term ‘deontology’ derives from the Greek words *deon* (duty) and *logos* (science).

In deontology, and more specifically, the moral philosophy of Immanuel Kant, according to Mark White, “ethics should not be associated solely with formal rules and obligation,” (301) but that Kant’s moral system can lodge many of the concerns of social relations, human fallibility, and embodying a unique emphasis on human dignity and judgment. In fact, as stressed by Kant, “act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of another, always at the same time as an end, and never simply as a means,” (429) therefore, Kantian ethics highlights human dignity. White continues that, “rather than rules, Kant more often wrote of ‘duties,’ and held that a person’s duties truly belong to her and are imposed on herself” (302). Then, Kantian duties are the result of a person’s autonomous will operating out of respect for moral law.

Abraham also deduces from his reading of Kant that one might act upon what duty requires, but “if it is not from goodwill, the action might not be moral” (48). He also suggests that, according to Kant, one action might be in a good way but not out of goodwill; thus, since the motivation behind the action is unclear, it might not be immoral, and as Abraham explains, he neglects the possibility of desires to decide what is moral. As a result, the origin of any fulfilled duty is substantial and should be observed carefully in the context.

## **4. Analysis**

### **4.1. Just Stay Alive**

David Mitchell’s *The Bone Clocks* consists of six chapters, and each chapter covers a decade of different characters’ lives who are related to the main character, Holly Sykes. From the first chapter of this novel, the concept of duty is described chiefly as the characters’ duties upon themselves and the responsibility they have towards others. The characters in this novel find themselves in a different position; first they observe how others are performing their duty in the context given, then they judge how people manage to perform them. Finally, the aftermath of all the motivations and duty-fulfillments or negligence in the last chapter becomes obvious; Mitchell depicts a post-apocalyptic world where everyone lives a miserable life with a regretful feeling about the past.

Bourdieu believes that, “the first conditions for an adequate reading of the analysis of the relation between social positions, dispositions, and position takings, that is, the ‘choices’ made by the social agents in the most diverse domains of practice,” (*Practical*

Reason 6) where a relational concept or a habitus has to face position taking among different groups. In the first chapter Mitchell explains that, running away from home, Holly is at a crucial moment in decision-making; she decides to go somewhere no other escaped girls will go. According to Wilson and Denis, “reason and experience are required for determining the likely effects of a given motive or character trait, so reason does play an important role in moral judgment,” however, reason’s role is subordinate since there is a difference between being useful or conducive to pleasure and being good or virtuous; though, Bourdieu knows it as the first condition. Mitchell describes Holly’s decision as follows:

Every runaway teenager in England makes a beeline for London, imagining they’ll get picked up by a talent scout or fairy godmother, but I’ll strike out the opposite way, [...]; if you grow up in a pub you overhear exactly what sort of scouts and fairies pick up runaway teenagers in London. Maybe I could find a barn or an empty holiday chalet to stay in for a bit. That might work. (*The Bone Clock* 17)

She tries to make the most rational decision due to what she had heard in the bar where her family works. Her experience, or in Bourdieu’s term, her habitus, is structured not from what her parents or social class taught her but from what she had heard and learned from total strangers, possibly from different walks of life. Her decisions are made upon reason; though, what she did in the first place, escaping from home, is unreasonable and primarily due to her sensations. There is a transition from the old habitus of a teenage country girl to an experienced self-assured girl that proves Holly is “reconstructing the principles” (Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory* 162) though she goes against what she could do as a runaway girl. Deontology indeed calls this “a choice which satisfies the end,” (White 303) which is the case for Holly as well.

According to Couper, “Mitchell creates opportunities for his characters and readers to lose themselves, in the crowd” (2). It can be inferred that, the characters in *The Bone Clocks* encounter many challenges and struggles in their lives, and they have to make crucial decisions in order to attain their duty among the others, but what Mitchell concludes lies in a conversation between Holly and her friend in the last chapter and during the post-apocalyptic time. She has a message for her friend that “whatever happens, his first duty is to stay alive” (*The Bone Clock* 416). This is the code that the whole novel leads to from the very beginning.

This kind of self-centered decision-making is not only depicted in Holly’s duty towards her family. Even in her partner, Ed Brubeck, the same attitude can be observed. He needs to decide whether he should return to Iraq and attain his duty as a journalist

or stay home with his partner and daughter to fulfill his duty as a father. He needs some reasons to make this decision justifiable. As mentioned, Bourdieu centers the concept of habitus as the principle which negotiates between objective structures and practices to make him capable of transcending the dichotomies which have shaped the world (*Outline of a theory* 14). Here, Ed's morality does not allow him to abandon what he believes is his duty: "to honor his friends who had died in the war zone in Iraq," (*The Bone Clock* 213) nonetheless, he is ignoring the fact that he is abandoning his child and the mother of his child. He does not think about their future and what will happen to them, and he decides to leave them, nevertheless. In one of his reflections he excuses himself that,

Without Nasser and Aziz I'd have been reduced to parroting the Panglossian platitudes tossed to the press pack in the Green Zone. All of which begs the question, if journalism is so difficult in Iraq, why am I so anxious to hurry back to Baghdad and get to work?

Because it is difficult, but I'm one of the best.

Because only the best can work in Iraq right now.

Because if I don't, two good men died for nothing. (*The Bone Clock* 213)

That decision causes him death, as well. He dies in the war, and the accurate report he cherished never returned to England or anywhere else in the world. The fact that can be inferred from what Mitchell portrays is that Ed neglected his primary duty in life; to survive, and he ceased to do it. Throughout his chapter in the novel, Ed suffers from an inner struggle, dealing with paradoxes. Bourdieu believes that it is the concept of habitus which allows one to account for the paradox of purposiveness without an end. He explains that it is "not at all in the Kantian sense but in the sense of the paradox of purposiveness, not subject to the condition of an intention" (*Habitus and Field* 65). The point here, is not only limited to paradoxes and the problem of choice; it is also the matter of interest, in Bourdieusian sense, and preferences. Ed actually is redefining his duty in life, or in other words, self-creating new duties, neglecting himself and his family.

Regarding these characters' actions and reactions, self-created duty can be defined as a duty or a goal that one creates for herself to escape from the difficult situation that she is stuck with to find peace of mind. Both Holly and Ed escaped from difficult situations by creating a situation in which they could achieve their interests very well; thus, they could only serve themselves, regardless of what they were supposed to do.

Mitchell creates characters that hide their true intentions and move from what their habitus dictates them to do to what they prefer to do and are interested in. According to Bourdieu "it functions like a little generator to invent or engender something, what it produces appears to have been produced on purpose in order to adapt to whatever it has



adapted to - since it is in its very logic to adapt as far as possible to the structures within which it operates” (*Habitus and Field* 65). In order to do so it can be argued that although all these characters come from different habitus, they face a transition from one habitus to another, and they have the same attitude in their field of duty. These characters create a goal for their lives and make that their duty. That duty might not be moral to some points; but they are sure that they must fulfill them by any means. Mitchell in *The Bone Clock* implies that people are not creatures of habit anymore, because anything can change them quickly, and when they change, they should not be trusted since they simply can deceive. Hence, if a derivative motivates them, it cannot be their habitus but what this article calls a false-habitus that is not rooted in the past but at the moment, and under a particular circumstance, and is the result of the self-created duty. The reason the individuals intend to change the circumstances is their natural instinct to try to survive the situation; therefore, there is no surprise that this feeling affects the way of fulfilling their duties, mainly in the self-created duties.

In *The Buried Giant*, Kazuo Ishiguro expounds a medieval era in which an old couple, Axl and Beatrice, is suffering from forgetfulness, and as a result of their obliviousness, they cannot remember their ultimate duty; therefore, they find an excuse for creating new duties. Ishiguro, just like Mitchell, reveals the intentions of his characters gradually to clarify how they need to believe in their duty and take an interest in them. The warrior, the young boy Edwin, and Sir Gawain morally knew that they must attain their given duties, but their interests are different, and they intend to satisfy their interests rather than their duty and it is based on their collective memory, as Shaw explains. To fulfill this end, instead of going through what they are supposed to do, the characters do what they desire. The stem in this transition is their interests which pledges in their self-created duty. In this matter, it can be quoted from Bourdieu that, “The structures of the habitus are then determined by the structures of the field or a homologous field, and in this way they solicit an effective match with the effects that the structures of the field exert on people’s habitus in the form of the practical sense ‘that’s what I need to do’, ‘that’s right for me’, or ‘I like that’” (*Habitus* 259). As a result, they need to undergo different possibilities to choose the most preferred one to fulfill.

#### **4.2. Appearances Deceive Easily**

As discussed, the characters in these novels find the natural motives around them reasonable in their own interests but not in harmony with the others. For instance, it is clear that Holly does not feel at ease with her family and friends because she believes they betrayed her. Yet, when her younger brother is missing and she could help find him, she does not return and continues her quest alone. She does not want to help the family; she ignores the pace and rhythm she can have with them, and once again, she decides to

call what she is interested in her duty. White explains that “to Kant, weakness of will was an issue of character, reflecting a deficit of virtue, and agents have a moral responsibility to develop their resolve in the face of temptation,” (White 306) which justifies why Holly manipulated her choice to be a duty. Years later, Holly explains that she has written a book so her brother might read the book and find his way back to her! It seems that she has found a way to manipulate the circumstances; since her motivation in her actions has a self-interested reason. Bourdieu believes that, “The work of denial or repression can only succeed because it is collective and based on the orchestration of the habitus of those who accomplish it or, in simpler terms, on an unintentionally concluded or concerted agreement between the dispositions of the agents directly or indirectly concerned” (*Practical Reason* 121). Nobody blames Holly for her actions because this point does not appear to be immoral. Holly denies her negligence, since she is transiting from one habitus to another to accomplish her goal, she has to ignore any obstacle which comes forth.

Kant, on the other hand, declares if one’s duty “is not from goodwill, the action might not be moral” (Abraham 48). At first glance, Holly acts by reason, trying to survive; however, what she did was manipulation of the reason. She knew her parents were devastated to find her and her lost brother, but she does not find it her duty to go back and help her family. She justifies that she will find a way to find her brother later. Thus, it is not her goodwill that fuels her to go on; it is not also immoral, but a manipulation of reason, that serves her best.

As mentioned earlier, Bourdieu defines habitus as “a locus of intentions of meaning, of meaningful intentions of which they are not strictly speaking the subjects, because that is not how they see the goals of their action” (*Habitus and Field* 64). Crispin Hershey, locates his intention in taking revenge from the critic that degraded his novel as his right, so he creates a new odd, but self-interested duty to perform and overlooks his first duty which is to survive. Crispin does a prank which costs a lot for both of them. When the character was planning for revenge, nothing sounded severe. He did not suppose that it would cause serious damage. He only wanted to destroy the critic’s reputation, but it became grave. Crispin contemplates that what he had done as an act of revenge and tries to justify his action as the “imperative notion of right and wrong” (Guas 189). However, what he did was merely a self-created duty to manipulate the situation. He justifies himself in his reveries many times:

Richard Cheeseman committed the action: I am the reaction. Ethics are Newtonian. Maybe what I just said was sufficient to trigger a bag inspection. Maybe it wasn’t. [...] Maybe the embarrassment will cause Cheeseman to lose his column in the Telegraph. Maybe it won’t. I’ve done my bit, now it’s up to Fate. (*The Bone Clock* 321)

He started plotting to take revenge, since he believes he is only a means in the hands of fate, which is about to bring up justice. In this way, he intends to explain his duty in life. His morality at first tells him that avenge will help him raise justice; but after he observes the graveness of the circumstances, his morality calls for help, though he is tied-handed. Self-approval, as well as self-acceptance, motivates his actions and what he calls his duty. Crispin's morality comes up right after he finds the graveness of his action. However, it does not stop him. He does not confess or take the blame, since, as the manipulation of this self-created duty goes, Cheeseman deserves them and he only did his duty to ruin his reputation and avoid the repetition of a similar scenario for other writers. Yet, to make it appear as moral or reasonable, he decides to help him unconditionally, and this is his new strategy to win the game in the field of competition. However, he is unsuccessful in the last set of this game; Cheeseman discovers he caused all his misfortunes and kills him.

In *The Buried Giant*, as well, Ishiguro depicts how the characters manipulate others to portray their preferences as a duty. It first comes forward when Axl and Beatrice meet the strange old woman and the boatman. The boatman describes his duty, they feel for it, and they agree that he has to do his job in the best way. Thus, here again, manipulation esteems performing the duty. The boatman explains that "it falls to us to perceive if their bond is strong enough to cross together. This lady is reluctant to accept it, but her bond with her husband was simply too weak. Let her look into her heart, then dare say my judgment that day was in error" (*The Buried Giant* 45). The old woman could not defend herself since she knew she was being played, but she could not prove anything. Then Beatrice comes to her aid and asks the boatman about the procedure to manage his duty. In the answer, the boatman hesitates, which is a sign of manipulation as Bourdieu defines the duty, and the ploy is revealed. The boatman claims that by telling their most cherished memories, the true nature of their bond will be revealed, but Beatrice notes the fact that "appearances deceive so easily" (*The Buried Giant* 48). This fact is liable to the intentions of all the characters mentioned in this article; they deceive others by showing goodwill but doing evil. Bourdieu calls these "objectively organized strategies" (*Outline of a Theory* 71) without being the product of a genuine strategic intention. This strategy would presuppose as one strategy among other possible strategies.

Later on, when Axl and Beatrice talk to the warrior, they are still blind to the idea of manipulation, and they only insist on the fact that everyone should realize their duty. The warrior claims to be honest, and on the way, he does not do anything to prove otherwise; however, Ishiguro gives the reader more information to recognize how easily they were deluded. Only towards the end of the novel, the character confesses to his true aim, which does not seem moral, at all.

There are Britons who tempt our respect, even our love, I know this only too well. But there are now greater things press on us than what each may feel for another. It was Britons under Arthur slaughtered our kind. It was Britons took your mother and mine. We've a duty to hate every man, woman and child of their blood. So promise me this. Should I fall before I pass to you my skills, promise me you'll tend well this hatred in your heart." (*The Buried Giant* 237)

And he presents his actual duty; to hate every Briton. He tries to trick the young boy, to change what he is supposed to do and in this transition he imposes his own ideas on him. There is no Kantian goodwill at work since the warrior pretends that if he is to survive he should kill all Britons, so he tries to create a new duty for Edwin. If as Bourdieu asserts relation between the individual and the group creates the entity of each study, here, the concept of duty should be defined in the relation that the warrior creates with the young boy Edwin as well as the Britons. Whereas this article calls this transition a false-habitus, Yiping calls it "(re)shaping of group identity" (227); however, they are different in definitions. This article claims that false-habitus is the transition from what used to be there as the habitus but is manipulated to favor the character, and it is an individual conversion, not a group as Yipping believes it to be. The young boy needs to follow the warrior. On the other hand, he has another intention while he promises to follow the warrior's order. He understands that he is not wanted among his people anymore, and he remembers that he had promised her mother to find her after the invasion. So, he recreates his duty as was defined for him before. Firstly, he needs to evaluate the graveness of these two promises; accordingly he tries to remember what had happened to him.

Once he had asked out loud, "Did my aunt really curse me?" but no reply had come, and he had wondered if his mother had gone away. But then her voice had returned, saying, "Do your duty, Edwin. You're the mule. Don't stop just yet. You control everything. If you stop, so will those noises. So why fear them?" (*The Buried Giant* 89)

He recognizes that he will be in "control of everything" if he holds on to his duty and this is the best derive for him to go against his habitus. Ishiguro emphasizes that everyone in this novel is bound to a particular duty that they need to fulfill and he exposes that, others will suffer due to any shortcoming in attaining duty. Edwin, the young boy, pretends to help the warrior fulfill his duty, but he also maintains his own duty. He fears that if he does not satisfy his duty, his mother will die because of his negligence; this is the sense of necessity and duty, as Bourdieu describes in his theory, that the boy relies on to reason his action.

Sir Gawain is another character that neglects his duty and causes trouble for others. He also uses the element of pretense to fulfill his aim. He claims that slaying the dragon is his duty, but his desire is against this duty; therefore, he does not intend to deliver it. He says to the warrior, "It is my duty to slay Querig, Master Wistan! Horace and I have laid careful plans to lure her out and we seek no assistance!" (*The Buried Giant* 122), but in fact, he tries to mislead others, and believes that what was set as his duty by King Arthur was not just and reasonable. He describes the joy he gains from watching the dragon fly over the hills, and he believes that although it is his duty to kill her, it is not what he desires. Thus, creating a self-desired duty, he continues his journey pursuing his own interest.

He finds the dragon; however, the warrior and Edwin had found her earlier, so he looks desperate and disappointed as if he does not have any other end to obtain. He does not do his duty, and he dies in despair and disappointment. In his reveries, Sir Gawain sees his life and what he had done and what he had not, and he regrets most of them. He sees people's anger towards him: "He dreads his duty! See it on his face. He dreads his duty!" (*The Buried Giant* 202); he hallucinates women scorn him for neglecting his duties. Sir Gawain knows that the negligence of his duty made him an object of disdain among people. They shout at him because he failed; though, he cannot help his desire which is against his duty. It is obvious that regardless of the created false-habitus, he could not attain his goal.

## 5. Conclusion

*The Bone Clocks* and *The Buried Giant* depict the pursuit of duty in their characters, whereas one intends to show how holding to the duty affects one's personal life, and the other portrays the effect of holding to the duty on the others' lives as well as how neglecting the duty harms the others, respectively. By observing these novels, the motivation and reasoning behind the duties became clear in order to decide they are derived by manipulation, as Bourdieu proposes. Finally, this research gave a new definition of duty as it is portrayed in these contemporary novels.

Fulfilling duty, as it is represented in these novels, is entwined with desire and interest, which directly leads the characters to disinterestedness in others' affairs, manipulation, and deceit. As is concluded from these novels, the characters tend to change different circumstances to their own benefit in different fields by attempting to create a self-desired duty that can serve them well. This self-created duty appears in a false habitus, which is a transitional point from what their habitus suggests they do to what they desire to do. The morality of duty or goodwill is not the crucial aspect here since the characters should do their best in order to survive. An extreme belief in self-

created duty makes the characters follow their own interests, meaning that they are disinterested in whatever stops them from attaining their desired aim. To justify their actions, they form a false-habitus, which is simply the result of the characters' self-centeredness; the characters are only concerned with their own profits.

Ultimately, the article decides that the reasoning behind the duties is manipulative and that this manipulation and deception, which come along with the characters' desires, define duty in these novels. The characters are prone to creating duties that are immoral and manipulating others' minds to achieve their primary duty, which is to survive. It proves that they are not creatures of habit anymore; anything can change them, and they should not be trusted when they change. Likewise, the truth does not matter either; the only thing that seems important is the appearance of the truth, the elusive and imaginary truth; what one can only hold on to are the words, the words that can deceive and manipulate easily.

---

---

## References

- Abraham, Kow Kwegya Amissah. "On Immanuel Kant's Concept of Duty." *UJAH*, vol. 20, no 2, 2019, pp 27-52.
- Amid, Hafiza. *Negotiating Forms, Experimenting Genres: a Study of Kazuo Ishiguro in Three Novels: The Remains of the Day, Never Let Me Go, and The Buried Giant*. 2018. Nanyang Technological University, MA thesis.
- Black, Shameem. *Fiction Across Borders: Imagining the Lives of Others in Late Twentieth-Century Novels*. New York, Colombia University Press, 2010.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Habitus and Field; Lectures at the College de France (1982-1983)*. Edited by Patrick Champagne, Julien Duval, Franck Poupeau, and Marie-Christine Riviere, Translated by Peter Collier, Politi Press, 2020.
- . *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Translated by R. Nice, Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- . *Practical Reason*. London, John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- . *The Logic of Practice*, Translated by R. Nice, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1990.
- Colombino, Laura. *Transcending The Postmodern*. London, Routledge, 2020.
- Couper, Simon. *Together in the Crowd of Time: Temporal Decentreing and Ethical Action in David Mitchell's The Bone Clocks*. 2020. Dalhousie University, MA Thesis.
- Gaus, Gerald. "What is Deontology? Part Two: Reasons to Act." *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, vol. 35, no. 1, 2001, pp. 179-193.
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *The Buried Giant*. London, Alfred A. Knopf, 2015.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*. Translated by T. K. Abbott, Longmans, Green and Co. Ltd, 1956.
- Korsgaard, Christine. *Natural Motives and The Motives of Duty; Hume and Kant on our Duty to Others*. Harvard University Press, 2012.
- Mitchell, David. *The Bone Clocks*. London, Sceptre, 2015.
- Olson, Robert. "Deontological Ethics." *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Paul Edwards, Macmillan, 1967, pp. 489-510.
- Shaw, Karen. "Some Magic is Normality: Fantastical Cosmopolitanism in David Mitchell's The Bone Clocks." *C21 Literature: Journal of 21<sup>st</sup> century Writings*, vol. 6, no. 5, 2018, pp. 1-19.
- White, Mark. "In Defence of Deontology and Kant: A Reply to van Staveren." *Review of Political Economy*, vol. 21, no. 2, 2009, pp. 299-307.
- Wilson, Eric Entrican and Lara Denis. "Kant and Hume on Morality." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, 2018.
- Yiping, Wang. "Ethnic War and the Collective Memory in Kazuo Ishiguro's The Buried Giant." *English Studies*, vol. 102, no. 2, 2021, pp. 227-242.